

REMARKS

The present application was filed on October 30, 2003 with claims 1-36. Claims 1-28 have been canceled without prejudice and claims 29-36 remain pending. Claims 29 and 36 are the pending independent claims.

In the Office Action dated October 16, 2007, the Examiner: (i) objected to the specification; (ii) objected to claim 29; (iii) rejected claims 29-36 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0023952 (hereinafter “Harmon”); and (iv) rejected claims 29 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0130572 (hereinafter “Bala”).

With regard to the Examiner’s objection to the specification, the Applicants have respectfully amended, without prejudice, the specification as requested by the Examiner. Applicants have capitalized any trademarked terms. Furthermore, Applicants have spelled out the acronym “HTTP/S” on page 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

With regard to the Examiner’s objection to claim 29, Applicants have respectfully amended the claim as requested and without prejudice. More specifically, claim 29 no longer contains the word “new.” Further, in order to clarify the wording of the claim language, Applicants have amended independent claims 29 and 36, without prejudice. The claims now recite, “customizing a control of a user-interface of an existing application” in place of --customizing a user-interface control of an existing application--. Further, claims 29 and 36 now recite, “install a user-interface control” in place of --install the user-interface control--. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to claim 29.

With regard to the §102(e) rejection under Harmon, Applicants respectfully assert that Harmon fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 29-36 for at least the reasons presented below.

It is well-established law that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants assert that the rejection based on Harmon does not meet this basic legal requirement.

Independent claim 29, as amended, recites an apparatus for customizing a control of a user-interface of an existing application. The apparatus comprises a memory; and at least one processor, coupled to the memory operative to: (i) record a procedure description comprising a series of actions performed by a user in the application user-interface; and (ii) install a user-interface control relating to the procedure description in the existing application for automatic execution of the procedure description and generation of the series of actions performed by the user when the user-interface control is activated. Independent claim 36 recites similar limitations.

In one illustrative embodiment of the claimed arrangement, a procedure description comprising a series of actions performed by a user in the application user-interface is recorded (e.g., Specification, pg. 6, line 12, to pg. 7, line 21; FIG. 2). In an additional embodiment of the present invention, a user-interface control is installed in an existing application. The user-interface control relates to the procedure description for automatic execution of the procedure description and generation of the series of actions performed by the user when the user-interface control is activated (e.g., Specification, pg. 5, line 16, to pg. 6, line 11).

Applicants submit that Harmon fails to anticipate an apparatus for customizing a control of a user-interface of an existing application. Harmon does not teach installing a user-interface control relating to the procedure description in the existing application for automatic execution of the procedure description and generation of the series of actions performed by the user when the user-interface control is activated.

The Examiner argues that Harmon teaches installing a user-interface control relating to the procedure description in an existing application for execution of the procedure description at FIGs. 3-4 and paras. 40-43. Further, the Examiner argues that Harmon teaches generating a series of actions when the user interface control is activated at FIG. 5 and paras. 52-56. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants submit that Harmon teaches a method of recording and playing back events that occur through a graphical user interface (GUI). See Harmon, Abstract. Harmon does this by recording all mouse and keyboard events from a user. After recording these GUI events, a script file is generated comprising instructions based on the recorded events. See Harmon, paras 40-43 (Harmon discloses a Winreach script file (WRS) and a WinReach byte-code (WRB)). Harmon then teaches the use of an event player to execute the

script file. See Harmon, para. 44. Therefore, instead of teaching the installation of a user-interface control into the existing application, Harmon teaches a separate application to “playback” the recorded events (e.g., mouse clicks and keyboard events). Id. (Harmon teaches the use of a WinReach Player).

Installing a user-interface control in an existing application is described in one illustrative embodiment of the specification, for example, at page 5, lines 16-25:

A control installer component 110 is responsible for retrieving procedure descriptions 132 from procedure repository 108 and binding them to new or modified controls within application 102. This is accomplished by sending commands 142 to operating system 104, instructing operating system 104 to create and add the new controls or modify existing controls. An example of the creation of a new control is the addition of a new button to an existing toolbar within application 102. Modern operating systems typically provide APIs that facilitate creating and adding new controls in this manner. In addition to creating and registering the new control, control installer 110 will add additional information modifying procedure description 132 and creating procedure description 134 containing details of the new control, such as its location and type.

An additional illustrative embodiment can be found in the specification at page 8, lines 10-23:

Referring now to FIG. 3, a flow diagram illustrates a procedure control installation methodology in the application user-interface, according to an embodiment of the present invention. This may be considered a detailed description of the interaction between control installer 110, operating system 104, and application 102 in FIG. 1. A control installer first sends a request to the operating system to install the new control or modify the existing control in step 300. For example, the request may be to add a new button to an existing toolbar within the application, to add a new toolbar containing a new button to the top-level application window, or to add a new item to an existing menu within the application interface.

The installation request contains a callback routine location and/or other activation information that will be required to actually run the procedure. Using this information, the operating system creates the new control, and installs it in the application user-interface in step 302. Additionally, the operating system registers the callback in step 304, using the location supplied by the control installer.

For at least these reasons, Harmon does not anticipate the limitations of independent claims 29 and 36. It follows that claims 30-35 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 29. Further, dependent claims 30-35 recite patentable subject matter in their own right. For instance, Harmon does not teach receiving the application user-interface structure information from the operating system at the procedure capturer as recited in dependent claim 30. See Specification, pg. 6, lines 15-27. Also, Harmon does not teach registering a procedure capturer with the operating system to receive notification of user actions and system actions as recited in dependent claim 31. Further, Harmon does not teach an installed control as recited in claim 34. Nor does Harmon teach altering the appearance of at least one existing user interface control as recited in dependent claim 35. Altering the appearance of at least one existing user interface control is described in one illustrative embodiment of the specification at, for example, page 9, line 26, to page 10, line 9:

In addition to adding new controls to an existing application, the inventive technique described herein can be used to alter the visible appearance of existing controls within an application. This kind of alteration of appearance is commonly known as “skinning.” A set of alternate controls for existing operations can be created for any application. Underlying application controls may be invoked for the controls that are being reskinned, by simulating the actions (e.g. Mouse click, key press) required to activate that control. Thus, it is possible to have a control that does not use a prerecorded procedure from the procedure repository, but simply passes the events to the operating system and application. For example, an overlay window may have a round button where the original application had a square button. When the round button is pressed by the user, the proxy simulates a press of the original square button.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claims 29-36.

With regard to the §102(e) rejection of claims 29 and 36 in light of Bala, Applicants have amended independent claims 29 and 36, without prejudice, to clarify the subject matter of such claims. Claims 29 and 36 now recite, “install a user-interface control relating to the procedure description in the existing application for automatic execution of the procedure description and generation of the series of actions performed by the user when the user-interface control is activated.” Support for the amendment may be found in the specification at page 6, lines 4-11.

Applicants submit that Bala teaches the authoring and execution of task wizards (e.g., help procedures/instructions). See Bala, Abstract. As described in Bala at FIGs 5A-5J and

paragraphs 59-73, Bala discloses a series of pop-up windows that teach a user how to perform a specific task. As an instruction is presented to a user, the system pauses and waits for user input (e.g., Back, Next, Finish). Therefore, in contrast to the Examiner's argument, Bala does not teach the automatic execution of the procedure description and generation of the series of actions performed by the user when the installed user-interface control is activated.

For at least these reasons, Bala does not anticipate the limitations of claims 29 and 36. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §102 rejection of independent claims 29 and 36.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 29-36 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the objections and §102(e) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William E. Lewis". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "William" being the most prominent part.

Date: December 17, 2007

William E. Lewis  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 39,274  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
90 Forest Avenue  
Locust Valley, NY 11560  
(516) 759-2946